INTRODUCTION

The commander drives the intelligence effort.
—FM 100-5, 14 June 1993

Over the last 20 years, the MI Corps has matured rapidly and become integral to combat organizations. We did this by eliminating the "stovepipes" in counterintelligence (CI) and signals intelligence (SIGINT), and breaking down the so-called "green door" to intelligence. We created multidiscipline MI battalions at division, and brigades at corps and theater. We oriented our training on tactical and operational level IEW support to commanders. In so doing, we created leaders and soldiers who understand tactics and who are technically proficient in focusing downwardly the BOS we call Intelligence on commanders who lead soldiers in combat. The fruits of our efforts were demonstrated in the MI Corps' successful performance during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

After Operation Desert Storm, the Chief of Staff, US Army, took steps to review Army operations. He did this to assess lessons learned from the Gulf War and to review Army doctrine, training, and organization in the new geopolitical setting of the post-Cold War era. In a few short months, we moved from a national strategy of deterrence to one of force projection. As part of this overall Army effort to adapt to the force projection mission articulated in FM 100-5, MI also underwent a significant introspection. MI conducted a detailed assessment, called MI Relook, to review how MI operated in the Gulf War, and how MI must support commanders in scenarios that range from peacekeeping to large-scale conflict. These findings became the basis for major changes in MI, and in 1993, the Army Chief of Staff approved MI's Force Design Update. The approved doctrinal changes from these findings are contained in this, the capstone manual for MI, FM 34-1.

MI continues building a balanced force driven by sound doctrine and training which focuses intelligence downwardly on the commander, to deliver intelligence on time, every time. MI battalions at division are changing to balance capabilities with human intelligence (HUMINT), imagery intelligence (IMINT), multidiscipline counterintelligence (MDCI), and SIGINT. The United States Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) MI brigades are also changing structure and orienting their support downwardly.

The Corps MI Support Element (CMISE) in each corps from INSCOM's theater MI brigades is emplaced to help gain priority for, and to focus theater and national intelligence on, the corps. We continue fielding and improving intelligence fusion and dissemination systems, like the All-Source Analysis System (ASAS) and TROJAN Special Purpose Intelligence Remote Integrated Terminal (SPIRIT), into divisions, corps, and theaters.

The MI Corps has given considerable thought to IEW support to force projection operations. Training and doctrine have prepared the Army to fight and win "Day One" of any battle. But, in force projection operations, getting to the battlefield and winning decisively while protecting American lives requires that the intelligence effort begin long before that first day. This requires that force readiness take on a new meaning. If our divisions, corps, and theater forces stand ready to project force anywhere in several potential contingencies, then their intelligence support should also be at the same or higher level of readiness. Consequently, commanders must have routine, direct, continuous and active links into the intelligence system to provide and, perhaps more important, to focus intelligence on their tactical and operational needs early. Readiness means that MI must develop broad knowledge on priority contingency areas, update those data bases daily, and be prepared to surge in support of emerging missions. We cannot assume that the intelligence data bases and access will be there upon alert unless commanders drive their intelligence effort daily.

Readiness requires MI to execute the principle of "train as you fight." MI leaders and soldiers must master the tactical and technical skills which will enable them to fully exploit the potential of the Intelligence BOS. They must be trained to understand the dynamics of combined arms operations and how to synchronize the intelligence effort with the commander's concepts. Training must be focused on providing commanders with an intelligence force capable of supporting force projection operations. And, every opportunity must be taken to integrate realistic mission-oriented intelligence scenarios, processing, and communications into joint and combined arms training events.

Force projection means MI must be more flexible and capable of deploying small teams with links to a remote base that is dedicated to pushing intelligence, specifically designed for the tactical commander, forward. MI must be capable of tailoring the MI entry and follow-on forces to meet the commander's needs. MI will go in light for deployment and protection reasons then build to a force capable of sustained IEW operations. Also, in force projection, tactical intelligence comes from the top down during significant stages of the operation until organic tactical intelligence elements are engaged. Because of this, MI must be prepared to execute a crossover or transition from operational intelligence support from higher echelons to tactical intelligence support from in-theater IEW assets.

There will also be a premium on HUMINT, MDCI, and SIGINT resources during force projection operations. IMINT capabilities like the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS), and Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities (TENCAP) downlinks will also be limited. That means brigades, divisions, and corps must pull intelligence in from above their levels and focus it on specific priorities. Moreover, this requirement calls for solid links to, and integration with, national and joint intelligence assets. INSCOM is a major player in that endeavor to bridge the gaps between echelons and create a seamless intelligence architecture from tactical forces to national level organizations.

By its very nature, force projection is a joint effort. This is particularly true in IEW operations. Air Force and Navy intelligence assets are often the

force commander's principal source of operational intelligence. On the ground, Army and Marine Corps IEW units are relied upon for collection of tactical intelligence. Each service depends upon the other's intelligence resources and products to develop a comprehensive, accurate picture of the battlefield. To varying degrees, this same situation also applies to combined operations where US Forces may rely upon the intelligence and communication services of other nations. To this end, we must strive for intelligence organizations and systems which are compatible and interoperable in a joint or combined environment. The benefit of this effort is a seamless intelligence system, which allows the push-pull of intelligence between echelons and services, and is capable of supporting commanders from pre-crisis to redeployment throughout the range of military operations.

These and other aspects of force projection operations have changed the way we must think and direct intelligence. They point out the pivotal importance of the commander's role in intelligence, not just when the crisis begins, but well before and throughout the operation. Force projection requires flexibility, intelligence, agility, and focus. We must review the entire way we synchronize collection operations and all-source analysis with the commander's operation. We must reorient training so commanders and G2s (S2s) alike learn the range of IEW capabilities and how to bring them to bear on tactical priorities. Furthermore, a focus downwardly requires those at levels above corps to understand the tactical ground commander's IEW needs. They have to visualize the commander's perspective and tailor the products for his decisions.

The end of the Cold War and the rapid changes in the world's geopolitical environment provide a challenging setting for military operations. A setting in which commanders must redefine force readiness and the priority they place on intelligence. We no longer face the single "threat" of the Soviet Union but many potential missions—missions which require an active command role in focusing IEW assets on priority requirements daily. Success in war and OOTW could depend on how well "the commander drives the intelligence effort."